

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

Chris Schroeder,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 22-11055

v.

Judith E. Levy

United States District Judge

Victor Hill, *et al.*,

Mag. Judge Kimberly G. Altman

Defendants.

_____/

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION [27]

Before the Court is *pro se* Plaintiff Chris Schroeder’s “emergency motion for en bank review + or a special master.” (ECF No. 27, PageID.114; *see also id.* (stating that Plaintiff “seeks En Bank review + or a Special Master under Rule 53”); ECF No. 28 (documents that appear to be exhibits to Plaintiff’s motion).)

Plaintiff filed the complaint in this case on May 9, 2022. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff’s complaint identified as Defendants Victor Hill, Clayton County, Georgia Regional Hospital, and several John Does. “As best as can be gleaned from the complaint, Schroeder is claiming various

violations of his constitutional rights apparently related to a criminal proceeding in the state of Georgia.” (ECF No. 23, PageID.82.)

Plaintiff’s new motion arises from that same dispute. He alleges that “[t]he unlawful acts of Clayton Co. + Does ET. AL. are ongoing” and “[s]ince it’s ongoing there’s no need to file a new suit. To file a new suit would be redundant” (ECF No. 27, PageID.114, 119.)

This motion is denied as moot because the case was dismissed with prejudice on June 1, 2023. (ECF No. 25.) Because this case is dismissed, the Court cannot grant the relief Plaintiff seeks in his motion.

To the extent Plaintiff requests relief from the final judgment of this case, Plaintiff does not provide any grounds for relief. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60. Crucially, a motion for relief from a final judgment, order, or proceeding “must be made within a reasonable time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1). If the grounds for relief involve certain reasons, such as “fraud . . . , misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party,” the motion for relief from a final judgment, order, or proceeding must be made “no more than a year after the entry of the judgment.” *Id.*

This case was closed nearly two years ago, and Plaintiff does not provide grounds for relief from the final judgment in this case. For the

reasons set forth above, Plaintiff's "emergency motion for en bank review + or a special master" is DENIED as MOOT. (ECF No. 27.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 1, 2025
Ann Arbor, Michigan

s/Judith E. Levy
JUDITH E. LEVY
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or first-class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on April 1, 2025.

s/William Barkholz
WILLIAM BARKHOLZ
Case Manager